

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/787,021	04	4/18/2001	Naoyuki Kobayashi	HST10112PUSA 8135		
5	7590	12/09/2002				
Lawrence G	Almeda			EXAMINER  LEADER, WILLIAM T		
Brooks & Kus Twenty Secon	d Floor					
1000 Town Ce Southfield, MI				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
,				1741		
				DATE MAILED: 12/09/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			53		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/787,021	KOBAYASHI ET AL.			
Advisory Notion	Examiner	Art Unit			
	William T. Leader	1741			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress		
THE REPLY FILED on 11/18 and 11/20 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice  i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	ension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) Method they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);			
(b) M they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	implifying the		
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.		
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NC	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: none.					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-8 and 11-24</u> .					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disap	proved by the Exam	niner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·			
10. Other:					



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant proposes to amend the concentration of dissolved zinc cations from at least 20 g/l to at least 50 g/l. This amendment present claim limitations not previously examined and would require further consideration. Additionally, basis for the proposed amendment in the specification is not apparent..

NAM NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700